

Serial No. 09/965,400

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected to the title. Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 USC section 103 based on various combinations of Rothweiler with one or more of Nishiguchi, Simpson, Satyamurti, Rotola-Pukkila, and Scott. In view of the following comments, the Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration of the claims as presented herein is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 recites:

training a Lloyd-Max quantizer with pitch values of those speech signals characterized as being substantially fully voiced in the characterizing step and not training the quantizer with at least some of the speech signals characterized as being partially voiced; and
quantizing the pitch values of at least the speech signals characterized in the characterizing step as being substantially fully voiced and the speech signals characterized in the characterizing step as being partially voiced.

Claim 12 recites:

training a Lloyd-Max quantizer with the pitch values from the determining step of only those speech signals characterized as being substantially fully voiced in the characterizing step;
quantizing the pitch values of at least those speech signals characterized as being substantially fully voiced in the characterizing step and those speech signals characterized as being partially voices in the characterizing step.

Claim 15 recites:

a Lloyd-Max quantizer coupled to the voicing analyzer and pitch detector, the quantizer is trained with and quantizes the pitch values of those speech signals from the voicing analyzer characterized as being substantially fully voiced, the quantizer also quantizes, but is not trained with, at least some of the pitch values of those speech signals from the pitch detector not characterized as being substantially fully voiced.

Serial No. 09/965,400

The references relied upon by the Examiner do not characterize the speech signal and train a quantizer using the fully voiced speech signal but not the partially voiced speech signals as defined in claim 1. The references relied upon do not characterize the speech signal and train a quantizer with only those speech frames characterized as fully voiced as defined in claim 12. The references relied upon do not include an analyzer that quantizes, but is not trained with, at least some of the pitch values of those speech signals from the pitch detector not characterized as being substantially fully voiced as defined in claim 15. Accordingly, the prior art can not render the claimed invention unpatentable.

In the office action the Examiner acknowledges that the prior art does not disclose the claimed invention, but indicates it is common in the art. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's position. The Examiner must provide proof to make a *prima facie* case that the invention is not patentable.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is solicited.

Respectfully Submitted

Adut, Victor et al.

BY: 

Randall S. Vaas Date 5-19-2005

Registration No. 34,479

Phone (847) 523-2327

Fax. No. (847) 523-2350